

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02188 01 OF 02 221805Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 122991

R 221602Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1333

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2188

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FLANK SECURITY, SPC MEETING APRIL 21

REF: A. USNATO 1996 DTG 111440Z APR 75

B. USNATO 2024 DTG 121900Z APR 75

C. STATE 88619

BEGIN SUMMARY: SPC ON APRIL 21 AGAIN CONSIDERED DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG  
ON FLANK SECURITY. DUTCH AND BELGIAN REPS STRONGLY OPPOSED ITALIAN  
PROPOSAL TO DELETE REFERENCE TO GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN THE FORM

-

ULATION PART OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. DUTCH, BELGIAN AND  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02188 01 OF 02 221805Z

CANADIAN REPS FAVORED UK AMENDMENT OF THAT PART OF THE  
DRAFT GUIDANCE. MISSION REQUESTS GUIDANCE FOR NEXT SPC MEETING ON  
THIS SUBJECT IN PARA 12 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

1. PRIOR TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE ITALIAN AND UK PROPOSALS, THE BELGIAN FOOTNOTE TO THE FORMULATION PART OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE/REF A) UNDERWENT SLIGHT MODIFICATION TO REAS AS FOLLOWS: "THE QUESTION STILL REMAINS TO BE SETTLED BY THE ALLIES WHETHER OR NOT THESE GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS SHOULD BE DEFINED AND, IF DEFINED, WHAT THEY SHOULD BE." GREEK REP (CORANTIS) DID NOT CRITICIZE THE BELGIAN FOOTNOTE, BUT SAID HE STILL NEEDED APPROVAL FROM ATHENS. ITALIAN REP (CIARRAPICO) REMAINED SILENT. OTHER SPC MEMBERS APPEARED READY TO ACCEPT THIS FOOTNOTE.

2. SPC DEVOTED MOST OF THE DISCUSSION TO THE ITALIAN AND UK PROPOSAL AS THE PREVIOUS MEETING TO AMEND THE REFERENCE TO NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN THE FORMULATION.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) STRONGLY OPPOSED THE ITALIAN PROPOSAL (PARA 4, REF B) TO DELETE THE PHRASE ON GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION (THE PHRASE WHICH BEGINS "OR CIRCUMVENT, ETC."). HE SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ACTUALLY WANTED TO STRENGTHEN THE REFERENCE TO GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION. WHILE THEY COULD ACCEPT THE PRESENT LANGUAGE AS A COMPROMISE, THEY COULD UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES AGREE TO DELETION OF THE PRESENT REFERENCE TO GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION. SUCH A DELETION COULD ONLY GIVE THE OTHER SIDE THE IMPRESSION THAT THE ALLIES DID NOT ATTACH MUCH IMPORTANCE TO GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION.

4. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT), WHOSE DELEGATION HAD PREVIOUSLY NOT SAID MUCH OF THIS POINT, STATED BELGIAN SUPPORT FOR THE DUTCH POSITION. HE SAID THERE WAS NO HOPE THAT BELGIUM COULD ACCEPT THIS DRAFT GUIDANCE WITH THE DELETION WHICH ITALY HAD PROPOSED. HE SAID THAT IF ITALY NOW WISHED TO DEAL WITH THE WHOLE PROBLEM OF GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION AT A LATER DATE, THEN BELGIUM COULD ACCEPT CHANGING THE WORD "CIRCUMVENT" IN THE PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE TO "CONTRAVENTE", "COUNTERACT", OR "RUN COUNTER TO". HOWEVER, THE IDEA HAD TO BE THERE, AND BELGIUM WOULD NOT AGREE TO DELETING THE PHRASE IN QUESTION.

5. NORWEGIAN REP (SKEIE) ALSO EXPRESSED OPPOSITION TO THE ITALIAN  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02188 01 OF 02 221805Z

PROPOSAL.

6. ITALIAN REP MAINTAINED THE ITALIAN PROPOSAL. HE FURTHER PROPOSED THAT THE DELETION OF THE PHRASE ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FOOTNOTE REGISTERING ALLIED AGREEMENT THAT ALL CONCERNS CONTAINED IN THE DELETED PHRASE BE LATER CONSIDERED CAREFULLY IN THE CONTEXT OF GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION. NETHERLANDS AND BELGIAN REPS SAID THAT THIS FOOTNOTE WOULD NOT HELP THEM. U.S. REP (MOORE), WHO HAD DISCUSSED THE ITALIAN PROPOSAL WITH THE DUTCH REP ON APRIL 18, REMAINED SILENT ON THIS ISSUE PER REF C.

7. UK REP (BAILES), FURTHER EXPLAINED THE UK PROPOSED AMENDMENT (PARA 5, REF B) TO THE GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION PART OF THE FORMULATION. SHE STATED THAT HER AUTHORITIES WERE CONCERNED THAT THE OTHER SIDE WOULD INTERPRET REFERENCE TO REDEPLOYMENT TO REGIONS

"WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE, ETC" AS A REFERENCE TO INDIRECT REDEPLOYMENT, UK COULD ACCEPT THIS VIS-A-VIS THE FLANKS, BUT NOT VIS-A-VIS GENERAL NON-CIRCUMVENTION, SINCE IT COULD CONCEIVABLY HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON UK FLEXIBILITY WITHIN THE UK.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 02188 02 OF 02 221754Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /088 W

----- 122770

R 221602Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1334

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2188

8. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THE NETHERLANDS COULD GO ALONG WITH THE UK PROPOSAL, SINCE IT STILL MAINTAINED THE REFERENCE TO NON-CIRCUMVENTION OF THE OBJECTIVE OF ENHANCING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN EUROPE. BELGIAN REP SAID HE THOUGHT BELGIUM WOULD BE ABLE TO ACCEPT THE UK PROPOSAL. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID HE THOUGHT CANADA COULD ALSO ACCEPT THE UK PROPOSAL. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID FRG WAS FLEXIBLE ON THE NON-CIRCUMVENTIONPART OF THE GUIDANCE, AND COULD PROBABLY GO ALONG WITH THE MAJORITY. HE NOTED THAT IT WAS CLEAR FROM PARA 3(E) OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE THAT THE LLIES WOULD MAKE THEIR SPECIFIC PROPOSALS ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION AT A LATER DATE.

9. ITALIAN REP, AT ONE POINT IN THE DISCUSSION, RECALLED  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02188 02 OF 02 221754Z

DATALANO'S STATEMENT IN THE NAC ON APRIL 18 THAT GUIDANCE TO  
AHG ON FLANK SECURITY IS NOT URGENT, AND BEHREND'S REPLY THAT THE  
GUIDANCE WAS IMPORTANT BUT NOT URGENT. HE SAID THAT A PERIOD OF  
REFLECTION MIGHT BE NECESSARY. TURKISH REP (GUR)  
REPLIED THAT GUIDANCE ON FLANK SECURITY WAS BOTH IMPORTANT AND  
URGENT IN THE TURKISH VIEW.

10. COMMENT: THE DUTCH, NOW SUPPORTED BY BELGIUM, CONTINUE  
STRONGLY TO DEFEND THE "OR CIRCUMVENT" PHRASE. ITALIAN PROPOSAL TO  
DELETE IT HAS NO SUPPORT IN SPC. NEITHER DOES ITALIAN PROPOSAL  
OF A FOOTNOTE TO REGISTER ALLIED AGREEMENT TO CONSIDER AT A LATER  
DATE ALL CONCERNS IN THAT PHRASE. MISSION'S JUDGMENT FROM THIS  
MEETING IS THAT REFERENCE TO NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN THE FORMULATION  
PART OF THE GUIDANCE IS ESSENTIAL TO EARLY SPC GUIDANCE ON FLANK  
SECURITY.

11. THE UK PROPOSED AMENDMENT DOES NOT APPEAR TO RAISE MAJOR  
SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES. HOWEVER WE DO NOT SHARE THE UK CONCERN THAT THE  
OTHER SIDE WOULD INTERPRET "ADDED PRESENCE" AS MEANING "INDIRECT  
REDEPLOYMENT." THE ORIGINAL SENTENCE IN THE BELGIAN FORMULATION  
LAST FALL DID CONTAIN A REFERENCE TO INDIRECT REDEPLOYMENT, WHICH  
SPC DROPPED AT U.S. REQUEST. (NOTE: THE ORIGINAL VERSION OF THIS  
SENTENCE WAS "FORCES WITHDRAWN ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT AGREEMENT  
WILL NOT BE REDEPLOYED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY IN GEOGRAPHIC  
REGIONS WHERE THEIR ADDED PRESENCE, ETC.," AND SPC AGREED TO DROP  
"DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY") END COMMENT.

12 ACTION REQUESTED: IF POSSIBLE BY FRIDAY, APRIL 25, TO ALLOW  
CONSULTATION WITH INTERESTED DELEGATIONS PRIOR TO APRIL 28 SPC  
MEETING:

A. U.S. REP REMAINED SILENT ON THE "OR CIRCUMVENT" PHRASE  
AT THIS MEETING PER INSTRUCTIONS. HOW THAT WE HAVE DUTCH AND OTHER  
REACTIONS TO ITALIAN PROPOSAL, MAY MISSION REITERATE OUR PREVIOUS  
ACCEPTANCE OF THIS PHRASE?

B. WHAT IS WASHINGTON VIEW ON UK AMENDMENT? IF NECESSARY FOR  
SPC AGREEMENT, MAY WE ACCEPT IT?

C. DOES WASHINGTON HAVE A PREFERENCE FOR ALTERNATIVES TO WORD  
"CIRCUMVENT" AS SUGGESTED BY BELGIAN REP IN PARA 4 ABOVE?  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02188 02 OF 02 221754Z

BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 22 APR 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** CunninFX  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO02188  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t197504101/abbrzjnd.tel  
**Line Count:** 217  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 1996 DTG 111440Z APR 75 B. USNATO 2024 DTG 121900Z APR 75 C. STATE 88619  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** CunninFX  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 08 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <08 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: FLANK SECURITY, SPC MEETING APRIL 21  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA  
BONN  
LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

ATHENS  
COPENHAGEN  
ROME  
OSLO  
ANKARA

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006